

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1-14 are amended. No new matter is added.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 6-8 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the assertions set forth in the Office Action, claims 6-8 and 13 are amended to specify a computer readable media. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-8 and 13 recite statutory subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to claim 3 as not further limiting the subject matter recite in claim 2, from which it depends. Claim 3 is amended to specify character string division methods that further limit the subject matter of claim 2.

The Office Action also objects to claims 4, 8 and 11 for a minor informality. Claims 4, 8 and 11 are amended to spell out the acronym as requested.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 6, 9, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the assertions set forth in the Office Action, claims 1, 6, 9, 12 and 13 are amended to specify candidate documents to more clearly indicate which documents are being referred to in the claims. Further, claims 1, 6, 9, 12 and 13 are amended to specify acquiring "a plurality of documents from an information source according to a predetermined criteria." This is supported, for example, by at least paragraph [0047] of the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that it is not necessary to further

specify what documents are acquired, how the documents are acquired or why the documents are acquired.

In view of the foregoing clarifications, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 6, 9, 12 and 13 fully comply with 35 U.S.C. 112. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 6, 9 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143737 to Seki et al. (Seki). The Office Action rejects claims 2-5, 7, 8 and 10-11 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Seki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,167,398 to Wyard et al. (Wyard). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action interprets Figs. 8 and 9 of Seki to disclose a similarity computing device (similarity definition rule 804) that computes degrees of similarity between a group of documents, and a document extracting device (result priority rule 808) that extracts documents having a small degree of similarity (Seki, paragraphs [[0047] and [0049]]). With regard to the dependent claims, the Office Action interprets Wyard to disclose an n-gram method (col. 3, lines 36-41). However, Seki does not disclose the use of a sum of degrees of similarities between the candidate documents, as recited in each of the independent claims.

Although Seki makes it possible to eliminate overlapping, Seki does not make it possible to eliminate overlapping when the number of communication information (articles) is limited.

As recited in claim 1, for example, any number of the combination of documents are extracted. In other words, an arbitrary number of documents may be extracted. The devices and methods recited in the claims provide an optimal overlapping elimination while the number of articles is limited. The result is that document extracted may be performed, while the number of articles is limited, to obtain as much information as possible.

Although Seki appears to disclose an approach to solve the problem of communication information being overlapped, Seki does not appreciate or recognize any limit to the number of communication information. Thus, Seki does not have such an objective.

As such, Seki does not disclose or suggest a device or method to eliminate overlapping and to limit the number of communication information (articles), as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 12-14. Wyard does not remedy this deficiency of Seki. Therefore, claims 1, 6, 9 and 12-14, and claims 2-5, 7, 8 and 10-11 that depend therefrom, are patentable over Seki and Wyard, alone or in permissible combination. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Klifton L. Kime
Registration No. 42,733

JAO:KLK/klk

Date: July 24, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--